



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,669	01/14/2004	Markus Sapp	04860.P3026	5887
7590 James C. Scheller, Jr. BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			EXAMINER JONES, HUGH M	
			ART UNIT 2128	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			12/21/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/758,669	Applicant(s) SAPP, MARKUS	
	Examiner Hugh Jones	Art Unit 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 of U. S. Application 10/758,669, filed on 1/14/2004 are pending.

Drawings

2. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). **The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.** Therefore, the claimed **method/apparatus** must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. ***Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because*** the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter with no concrete, useful or tangible result.

Applicants have either merely claimed a manipulation of abstract ideas (Claim 1, for example which only recites a mathematical problem to be solved, namely the wave equation), abstract mathematical algorithms, or hypothetical mathematical constructs devoid of a concrete, useful and tangible result.

7. The issues contributing to the 101 issues are elaborated upon in the 112 rejections.

8. An invention which is eligible for patenting under 35 U.S.C. 101 is in the useful

arts when it is a machine, manufacture, process or composition of matter, which produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result. *The fundamental test for patent eligibility is thus to determine whether the claimed invention produces a “useful, concrete and tangible result.”* The test for practical application as applied by the examiner involves the determination of the following factors:

(1) Useful - The Supreme Court in *Diamond v. Diehr* requires that the examiner look at the claimed invention as a whole and compare any asserted utility with the claimed invention to determine whether the asserted utility is accomplished. Applying utility case law the examiner will note that:

(a) the utility need not be expressly recited in the claims, rather it may be inferred.

(b) if the utility is not asserted in the written description, then it must be well established.

Furthermore, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(2) Tangible - Applying *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994), the examiner will determine whether there is simply a mathematical construct claimed, such as a disembodied data structure and method of making it. If so, the claim involves no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea and therefore, is nonstatutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In *Warmerdam* the abstract idea of a data structure became capable of producing a useful result when it was fixed in a tangible medium

which enabled its functionality to be realized.

(3) Concrete - Another consideration is whether the invention produces a concrete result. Usually, this question arises when a result cannot be assured. An appropriate rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 should be accompanied by a lack of enablement rejection, because the invention cannot operate as intended without undue experimentation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 18, 35, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims recite producing sound "based" upon the simulating. For example:

18. A method according to claim 1, further comprising generating a sound based on movement of the simulated string.

There is no enabling support for this in the specification. As per claim 44, there does not appear to be any substantial corresponding structure.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2128

12. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. The claims are replete with lack of antecedent basis. For example, there is no antecedent basis for "string" and "force" in claim 1.

14. The claims do not comport with standard US practice.

15. The recitations after the preambles do not further limit the claims. Consider claim 1:

1. **A method of simulating, in a machine, a string using a wave equation that relates movement of the string in time to force acting on the string,
wherein the force acting on the string simulates a stream of a fluid medium flowing relative to the string.**

The claim is not limited by a positive step. Furthermore, there is no step corresponding to how the wave equation is used in the simulation. Furthermore, there is no claimed step relating to the simulation. See MPEP 2173.05(q):

Art Unit: 2128

Attempts to claim a process without setting forth any steps involved in the process generally raises an issue of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. For example, a claim which read: "A process for using monoclonal antibodies of claim 4 to isolate and purify human fibroblast interferon." was held to be indefinite because it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. *Ex parte Erlich*, 3 USPQ2d 1011 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986).

Other decisions suggest that a more appropriate basis for this type of rejection is 35 U.S.C. 101. In *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App. 1967), the Board held the following claim to be an improper definition of a process: "The use of a high carbon austenitic iron alloy having a proportion of free carbon as a vehicle brake part subject to stress by sliding friction." In *Clinical Products Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966), the district court held the following claim was definite, but that it was not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101: "The use of a sustained release therapeutic agent in the body of ephedrine absorbed upon polystyrene sulfonic acid." Although a claim should be interpreted in light of the specification disclosure, it is generally considered improper to read limitations contained in the specification into the claims. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969) and *In re Winkhaus*, 527 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1975), which discuss the premise that one cannot rely on the specification to impart limitations to the claim that are not recited in the claim.

Furthermore, the force can't simulate anything. It would be the simulated force acting on the simulated string that causes movement of the simulated string.

16. Consider claim 19:

19. A machine readable medium providing executable computer program instructions which when executed cause a data processing system to perform a method of simulating, in a machine, a string using a wave equation that relates movement of the string in time to force acting on the string,

wherein the force acting on the string simulates a stream of a fluid medium flowing relative to the string.

The "wherein" clause does not further limit the medium. No instructions are recited that would limit a proper *program product* claim.

Art Unit: 2128

17. The dependent claims are denoted as "method" claims and thus do not further limit the independent claim. They also appear to be "product" and "process" claims.

18. Consider claim 36:

36. An apparatus for simulating, in a machine, a string using a wave equation that relates movement of the string in time to force acting on the string,

wherein the force acting on the string simulates a stream of a fluid medium flowing relative to the string, said apparatus comprising:

means for storing data for said simulating; and

means for simulating.

The "wherein" clause does not further limit the preamble. It is noted that the only structure in the specification is that of a generic computer. See MPEP 2114:

Art Unit: 2128

APPARATUS CLAIMS MUST BE STRUCTURALLY DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE PRIOR ART

>While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims< directed to >an< apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. >*In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971);< *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original).

MANNER OF OPERATING THE DEVICE DOES NOT DIFFERENTIATE APPARATUS CLAIM FROM THE PRIOR ART

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) (The preamble of claim 1 recited that the apparatus was "for mixing flowing developer material" and the body of the claim recited "means for mixing ..., said mixing means being stationary and completely submerged in the developer material". The claim was rejected over a reference which taught all the structural limitations of the claim for the intended use of mixing flowing developer. However, the mixer was only partially submerged in the developer material. The Board held that the amount of submersion is immaterial to the structure of the mixer and thus the claim was properly rejected.).

**MATERIAL OR ARTICLE WORKED UPON DOES NOT LIMIT
APPARATUS CLAIMS**

"Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim." *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Furthermore, "[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims." *In re Young*, 75 F.2d 996, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)).

In *In re Young*, a claim to a machine for making concrete beams included a limitation to the concrete reinforced members made by the machine as well as the structural elements of the machine itself. The court held that the inclusion of the article formed within the body of the claim did not, without more, make the claim patentable.

In *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967), an apparatus claim recited "[a] taping machine comprising a supporting structure, a brush attached to said supporting structure, said brush being formed with projecting bristles which terminate in free ends to collectively define a surface to which adhesive tape will detachably adhere, and means for providing relative motion between said brush and said supporting structure while said adhesive tape is adhered to said surface." An obviousness rejection was made over a reference to Kienzle which taught a machine for perforating sheets. The court upheld the rejection stating that "the references in claim 1 to adhesive tape handling do not expressly or impliedly require any particular structure in addition to that of Kienzle." The perforating device had the structure of the taping device as claimed, the difference was in the use of the device, and "the manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself"

Note that this line of cases is limited to claims directed to machinery which works upon an article or material in its intended use. It does not apply to product claims or kit claims (i.e., claims directed to a plurality of articles grouped together as a kit).

19. Applicants are also reminded that "means for" claims can not rely upon incorporated material for structure.

Determination of whether the specification adequately discloses sufficient structure corresponding to means-plus-function claim limitation does not turn on whether patentee has "incorporated by reference" material into specification relating to structure; proper inquiry instead asks whether

Art Unit: 2128

structure is described in specification, and if so, whether one skilled in art would identify claimed structure from that description. 53 USPQ2d 1225 Atmel Corp. v. Information Storage Devices Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit.

20. The term "relative" in the claims is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "relative" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Note also that "relative to the string" is broad enough to include "normal to the string" or any other angle.

Double Patenting

21. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 2128

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

22. Claims 1-45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over patented claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/949/464. Claims 1-45 are anticipated by claims 1-30 in that claims 1-45 contain all the limitations of claims 1-30 of the instant application. Claims 1-30 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from claims 1-30 and as such are unpatentable for obviousness-type double patenting.

23. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

24. Claim 1 of the instant application is:

1. A method of simulating, in a machine, a string using a wave equation that relates movement of the string in time to force acting on the string,
wherein the force acting on the string simulates a stream of a fluid medium flowing relative to the string.

25. Claim 1 of 10/949,464 is:

1. A method of simulating a string using a wave equation that relates movement of the string in time to force acting on the string, wherein the string has a longitudinal axis in a first direction and is moveable in a second direction orthogonal to the first direction, and the force acting on the string simulates a stream of a fluid medium flowing relative to the string in a direction having a component in a third direction orthogonal to both the first and second directions.

No Claim Rejections

26. Where the bounds of the claims are indeterminable, the claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. *Personalized Media Communications, LLC v. International Trade Comm'n*, 161 F.3d 696, 705, 48 USPQ2d 1880, 1888 (Fed. Cir.

Art Unit: 2128

1998). Thus, whether a claim is invalid for indefiniteness requires a determination of whether one skilled in the art would be able to discern the scope of the claim "when read in light of the specification." *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In *Solomon v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 216 F.3d 1372, 55 USPQ2d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2000), we explain the purpose of this statutory requirement, stating: "As has been noted in the context of definiteness, the inquiry under section 112, paragraph 2, now focuses on whether the claims, as interpreted in view of the written description, adequately perform their function of notifying the public of the [scope of the] patentee's right to exclude." *Id.* at 1379, 55 USPQ2d at 1283. When the claims become so ambiguous that one of ordinary skill in the art cannot determine their scope absent speculation, such claims are invalid for indefiniteness. See *In re Steele*, 305 F.2d 859, 862-63, 134 USPQ 292, 295 (CCPA 1962).

27. See MPEP 2143.03:

"...In re Steele, 305 F.2d 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962) (it is improper to rely on speculative assumptions regarding the meaning of a claim and then base a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 on these assumptions)"

28. The numerous 112 and 101 issues complicate examination of this application. The Examiner, respectfully, has spent more than a few hours in an attempt to determine the unambiguous meaning of the claims. It is not possible to examine the claims with respect to prior art without additional considerable speculation.

Conclusion

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

ANZIAM J. 42 (E) ppC362-C384, 2000

C362

A numerical model of a towed cable-body
system

C. K. H. Chin* R. L. May* H. J. Connell*

(Received 7 August 2000)

Abstract

In this paper, the motion of a body towed by an aircraft on a long thin elastic cable is modelled. The motion of the cable is described by a system of partial differential equations, and a six degree of freedom model used for the towed body. The partial differential equations governing the motion of the cable-body system are solved numerically

* Department of Mathematics, RMIT University, GPO Box 2476V, Melbourne, Victoria 3001, AUSTRALIA. <mailto:chris.chin@rmit.edu.au>,
<mailto:rob@ems.rmit.edu.au> and <mailto:howard.connell@rmit.edu.au>

⁰See <http://anziamj.austms.org.au/V42/CTAC99/Chin> for this article and ancillary services. © Austral. Mathematical Soc. 2000. Published 27 Nov 2000.

- Kurmyshev; Transverse and longitudinal mode coupling in a free vibrating soft string; Physics Lett. A; pp. 148-160; 2002.
- Burgh et al.; The study of parametric excitation in a stretched string; Nonlinear Analysis (Pergamon); pp. 387-400; 2001.
- Turkyilmaz, Y. and Egeland, O., Boundary Control Design for Towed Cables via Backstepping, In Proceedings of the 7th European Control Conference, 2003

Art Unit: 2128

- Alberti; Stationary response of an infinite cable to a correlated moving turbulent force field; J. Acous. Soc. Amer.; pp. 1831-1833; 1981.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be:

directed to: Dr. Hugh Jones telephone number (571) 272-3781,

Monday-Thursday 0830 to 0700 ET,

or

the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, telephone number (703) 305-3900.

mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or (703) 308-1396 (for informal or draft communications, please label *PROPOSED* or *DRAFT*).

Dr. Hugh Jones

Primary Patent Examiner

December 6, 2006

HUGH JONES Ph.D.
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100